

Date: Fri, 13 May 94 04:30:06 PDT  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #201  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Fri, 13 May 94                      Volume 94 : Issue    201

Today's Topics:

    Antenna CC&R restrictions -- let's change the law  
        Code test speeds (2 msgs)  
        Music allowed on ham bands??  
    Question abt Digital Modulation Legality

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----

Date: 11 May 94 23:46:57 GMT  
From: uswnvg!cjackso@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: Antenna CC&R restrictions -- let's change the law  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

sohl,william h (whs70@dancer.cc.bellcore.com) wrote:  
: I offer my comments below, not as a criticism, but to merely  
: point out some clarifications of several points.

<original text about CC&R changes deleted>

: Don't expect much help from the feds because they are always reluctant  
: to stray into state issues. Contract law has a long standing history  
: of being a state by state approach and (IMHO) not generally changed  
: by action(s) at the federal level.

I disagree - there's PLENTY of precedent in from the 'Civil Rights Days'.  
The Feds decided to push (HARD!) the states into getting tough on local  
CC&Rs (and zoning, and..) that restricted blacks (and others) in various

ways. Also, the "action(s)" at the Federal Level don't necessarily have to be 'laws' per se. How about getting FEMA to withdraw funding/support/ disaster recovery services to any locality that had ordinances that violated the spirit of PRB-1 and/or allowed CC&Rs which did the same. In a LOT of places, that would certainly stir up some action!

--

Clay Jackson - N7QNM  
US WEST NewVector Group Inc  
Bellevue, WA  
uunet!uswnvg!cjackso

-----  
Date: 12 May 94 15:07:58 GMT  
From: yale.edu!noc.near.net!news.delphi.com!BIX.com!hamilton@yale.arpa  
Subject: Code test speeds  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

William=E.=Newkirk%Pubs%GenAv.Mlb@ns14.cca.CR.rockwell.COM writes:

>I think maybe it should just go:

> Novice/Tech Plus (element 1A) 5 WPM  
> General/Advanced (element 1B) 10 WPM  
> Extra (element 1C) 15 WPM

Why, for heavens' sake? The code's not that difficult. I went from not knowing it to passing 13 wpm in about two months using the ARRL tapes. And trust me, this was some kind of obsession during those two months. It was 10 or 15 minutes a day every day or two when I had some time. That was in Feb. Since then, I've tried to follow the same liesurely pace and now find that 15 is fairly easy and 20 looks attainable by the fall sometime.

If I can do it that easily, anyone can do it. I certainly have no special "ear" for this stuff. Anyway, certainly the Extra's supposed to be a "stretch" -- otherwise, what's the sense of accomplishment of earning it?

I say leave things where they are. Or if there are changes to be made, consider some "Extra-Extra" licenses for really high-speed code (> 30 wpm) or for demonstration of special skills in handling emergency traffic, etc.

Regards,  
Doug Hamilton KD1UJ hamilton@bix.com Ph 508-358-5715  
Hamilton Laboratories, 13 Old Farm Road, Wayland, MA 01778-3117, USA

-----

Date: 12 May 94 14:29:49 EDT

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!news.acns.nwu.edu!math.ohio-state.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!  
gatech!udel!pacs.sunbelt.net!DDEPEW%CHM.TEC.SC.US@network.ucsd.edu

Subject: Code test speeds

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <Cpp8x4.8Hs@icon.rose.hp.com>, greg@core.rose.hp.com (Greg Dolkas) writes:

>Well, let me throw in my \$.02...

>

>I am currently a Tech+, and have passed the written test for the General. I'm  
>studying to get to the 13wpm mark for the code test. I would guess that if  
>the test were at 10wpm I would probably pass.

>

>However, I am against lowering the code requirements.

>

>The 13wpm limit was set there for a reason - it forces you to hear code  
>differently than at the lower speeds, and hear it well enough that you can  
>be writing one character while listening to the next one(s). It is a matter of  
>skill. I don't believe that, if the need arose during some sort of emergency,  
>I would currently have the skill to be able to copy code at any rate with all  
>the distractions of band noise and commotion going on.

>

>Even though I probably will never make CW my primary operating mode, I am  
>proud of my 5 wpm accomplishment, and will be even more so by completing the  
>General upgrade at 13.

>

>Greg KD6GKW

Greg -- WELL SAID! CW is a discipline as well as a (highly enjoyable) form  
of amateur communication -- the main reason for lowering the code requirement  
is to sell equipment and let all kinds of no-brains into the hobby. There  
are enough of them already...80 meters at night sounds like CB!

-----

Date: Wed, 11 May 1994 16:19:42 GMT

From: newshub.sdsu.edu!nic-nac.CSU.net!usc!math.ohio-state.edu!  
cyber2.cyberstore.ca!nntp.cs.ubc.ca!unixg.ubc.ca!news.mic.ucla.edu!

library.ucla.edu!csulb.edu!csus.edu!netcom.@@ihnp4.ucsd.edu

Subject: Music allowed on ham bands??

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In <CpE101.n57@world.std.com> howi@world.std.com (howie cahn) writes:

>Similarly, 97.113(a)(4) also says:

>"No amateur shall transmit:

>... obscene or indecent words or language."

>This says to me that images are not covered here.

Have you heard "A picture is worth a thousand words"?

How about "sign language" used by hearing impaired?

There is more than one definition for the word "language", the second definition in my dictionary is "Transmission of emotions or ideas between any living creatures by any means".

Which definition do you think the FCC would apply if they didn't like what you were transmitting?

--GaryM

-----

Date: Wed, 11 May 1994 08:46:05 -0500  
From: psinntp!pbs.org!jernandez.pbs.org!user@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: Question abt Digital Modulation Legality  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Are modulation formts like QPSK,QAM,or GMSK permitted in the amateur VHF/UHF and microwave bands? If so, what part of the Rules&Regs cover this topic?

Thanks in advance

--

John J. Ernandez  
Communication Systems Engineer  
Public Broadcasting Service

E-Mail jernandez@pbs.org      Member:PRR Technical & Historical Society  
Phone: 703-739-5474              Southern Railway Historical Association  
Amateur Radio: KA2YAP

-----

Date: 12 May 94 08:59:47 -0500  
From: envoy.wl.com!reeve.research.aa.wl.com!aa.wl.com!pennind@decwrl.dec.com  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <VBREAUULT.94May5152253@rinhp750.gmr.com>,  
<2qlq0u\$fdo@hpbab.wv.mentorg.com>, <CpLLJ7.HHM@eecs.nwu.edu>d  
Subject : Re: [News] FCC Gets New Weapon

In article <CpLLJ7.HHM@eecs.nwu.edu>, hpa@ahab.eecs.nwu.edu (H. Peter Anvin) writes:

We have enough regulation already. We don't need some self appointed FCC censors to dictate to the American public what is moral or immoral, obscene or in bad taste. If we (the real users of radio) elect a governing body to do this then it becomes our own adopted moral code not theirs (FCC). As radio amateurs go for the most part we are a responsible group of individuals. We can police ourselves in this matter.

```
> Followup to: <2qlq0u$fdo@hpbab.wv.mentorg.com>
> By author:   Hank_Oredson@mentorg.com
> In newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
>>
>> or TV sets
>>
>> ("I understand that certain material offensive to me might appear
>>  on the screen of this TV set, and have had proper training in
>>  the use of both the channel selector and the on/off switch which
>>  are provided by the manufacturer so that I can avoid such material.")
>>
>
> This would not necessarily be a bad idea... would keep the
> archconservative pro-censorship league at bay...
>
>   /hpa
> --
> INTERNET: hpa@nwu.edu           FINGER/TALK: hpa@ahab.eecs.nwu.edu
> IBM MAIL: I0050052 at IBMMAIL   HAM RADIO:  N9ITP or SM4TKN
> FIDONET:  1:115/511 or 1:115/512 STORMNET:   181:294/101
> To the memory of Richard Nixon we will now dedicate 18 1/2 minutes of silence.
```

-----

Date: Thu, 12 May 1994 13:54:35 GMT  
From: newsgate.melpar.esys.com!melpar!phb@uunet.uu.net  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <phb.768060210@melpar>, <VBREAULT.94May5152253@rinhp750.gmr.com>,  
<2qlq0u\$fdo@hpbab.wv.mentorg.com>  
Subject : Re: [News] FCC Gets New Weapon

hanko@wv.mentorg.com (Hank Oredson) writes:

>Sure ... right ... let's have the dealers get signatures when:

>you buy an ice crusher

(plus a lot more)

>I find the views put forth by some folks on this thread to be silly  
>in the extreme. "I refuse to be accountable for my actions, put  
>the blame on the person who sold me the radio." seems to be the common  
>thread here. Perhaps the simple solution is to assign a "monitor"  
>to each of these folks - watch them every minute so they cannot do  
>themselves or others any harm. We even have a name for these monitors:

>"Baby Sitters"

Well, I'm sorry you feel that way, but you've really missed my point entirely. Perhaps it wasn't clear enough, so I'll try once more:

1. I never said dealers *\*should\** be held responsible; I merely held that up as a *\*possibility\**; obviously, some people think it's a bad idea.

2. In my discussions about the banning of the 10-meter linear, I thought I made it clear that sometimes it is necessary to take action beyond just "holding the perpetrator responsible." Had the FCC NOT taken that action, there would no doubt be many more illegal linears on 27 MHz than there are, and the burden on FCC resources would be increased significantly.

3. The purpose of any law is to *\*force\** people to behave in a responsible manner - well, one of the purposes, anyway. If everyone did that, we wouldn't need any laws. But people don't always act responsibly, so we have laws and a method of enforcing them. To not do this is anarchy, and everyone loses.

4. I'm against big government, especially big Federal agencies. If we allow radios to be sold indiscriminantly to anyone, with no requirement that the buyer be somehow informed that a *\*license\** is required, pretty soon we'll have bedlam on the marine bands and probably a lot of other crucial segments of the spectrum as well. The interference with vital communications will become so bad that either (a) the FCC will require massive increases in staff and equipment to deal with the "responsible perpetrators", or (b) the government will institute a massive crackdown on radio sales, maybe even giving a long second look as to why all those "hams" even exist, and perhaps passing stricter laws than we have now - or BOTH. (a) will cost me tax dollars, and I pay quite enough now, thank you very much. (b) runs the risk of infringing on the privileges currently afforded the law-abiding citizenry. Both are unacceptable.

5. I will once again ask the question which no critic has so far answered: In the absence of (a) a form or notice sold with the radio or (b) some notification by the dealer, how is the average citizen supposed to know that a license is required and the nature of the

penalties for using the radio without one? There are radios sold (such as CB radios) which do not require a license; what would lead an uninformed citizen to the conclusion that the radio he just bought is any different?

6. One again, for the record: I'm NOT out to get dealers or make their life any harder; I'm NOT advocating prosecuting dealers for the transgressions of an unlicensed operator (and "safety", such as implied with the ice crusher nonsense, doesn't even enter into it at all). What I AM saying is that, to PREVENT a deterioration in radio spectrum useage which ultimately results in a much bigger FCC (higher taxes) to police it and/or stricter laws on EVERYONE using that spectrum (look out, fellow hams!), doesn't it seem prudent to take a step in the direction of prevention by actively informing the buyer and having him acknowledge at the time of sale that he understands the requirement? If that is done, then the buyer AND ONLY THE BUYER is responsible if he operates without a proper license. And it doesn't need to be a special form, just a note at the bottom of the bill of sale.

Yes, the individual should be held responsible. No, the dealer should NOT be held responsible. But what's wrong with notifying the individual at the time of sale and having him acknowledge that he was notified by signing his name? That way, MOST buyers will go out and get a license; a FEW will try to operate without one, and hopefully they'll get caught. But, if they're NOT notified, a lot of them may INNOCENTLY operate without a license because the "thought it was some kind of CB." And, as consumers, don't they have the RIGHT to be notified of the requirements?

In closing, let me relate a personal story: Several years ago, I bought a chainsaw. Now, I had never owned a chainsaw before, but there were enough notices and warnings on the saw and in the manual to choke a good-sized horse. The law says that because of those warnings and labels, the \*dealer\* is \*not responsible\* for any accident or injury I suffer through negligence or misuse. Fair enough; that makes sense to me. The dealer who sold it, however, said to me "Sir, are you familiar with how to operate a chainsaw?" I responded that I really didn't, having never used one before (on the farm where I grew up we did everything with hand saws and axes). The dealer then spent the next 30 minutes showing me how to adjust the chain, how to service and clean the saw, how to position myself when cutting, how to avoid accidental kickback, etc., etc., including going outside and actually cutting some wood with it. I \*never forgot\* that lesson, and in fact it spurred me to actually READ THE MANUAL.

The dealer \*didn't have\* to do that, but as a responsible dealer he felt an obligation to protect his customer, even though

there was no \*legal\* requirement. I tell that story only because I wish all dealers who sell merchandise had that kind of an attitude; however, I \*DON'T\* wish for laws holding them (the dealers) responsible. I wouldn't mind a law which \*made sure\* that the BUYER has been informed and \*accepts\* responsibility.

```
=====
      *           Paul H. Bock, Jr. K4MSG      pbock@melpar.esys.com
    * *           Senior Systems Engineer      (703) 560-5000 x2062
*   *   *   *   E-Systems, Melpar Div.        Falls Church, VA
    **  G  **
    * *   * *   We meet upon the level, and we part upon the square
*       *       *
=====
```

-----

Date: Wed, 11 May 1994 18:39:41 GMT  
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!s1.gov!fastrac.llnl.gov!usenet.ee.pdx.edu!  
cs.uoregon.edu!reuter.cse.ogi.edu!psgrain!charnel.ecst.csuchico.edu!nic-  
nac.CSU.net!usc!math.@ihnp4.ucsd.edu  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CpK5tA.7vu@world.std.com>, <4p0qj4xQ50GV055yn@tyrell.net>,  
<Cpn9Hw.Jxq@world.std.com>regon.e  
Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman)  
Subject : Re: Music allowed on ham bands??

In article <Cpn9Hw.Jxq@world.std.com> drt@world.std.com (David R Tucker) writes:

>  
>The ol' FCC rule book is no help. It says you can send commands to  
>remote synthesizers (I guess commands aren't really encoded audio, are  
>they? Or are they?), as long as not "actual music is played on the  
>air." What're the definitions of the technical terms "actual music"  
>and "played"? Transmission of sound? They don't tell you.  
>  
>There seems to be a difference to me (perhaps that ability to recover  
>the audio in real time is the crucial factor?), but maybe the line has  
>grown too thin to enforce. Still, the \*information\* being transmitted  
>is sound, is it not, and technically that makes it a phone emission.  
>And I don't think doing away with the music prohibition is a very good  
>idea, although it may be a while before anyone really cares about the  
>digitized stuff, since it's too new.

Just how many angels \*can\* dance on the head of that pin? :-)

I think we have to look to the history and \*original intent\* of the regulation in order to determine what the FCC wants of us in this



realm. The prohibition of music transmission by amateurs only began in the early 1950s when certain stations started playing records over their 160 meter AM stations to amuse their friends. (Yes the rule is that recent.) There were also duplex conversations going on in the 160 meter band where two or more AM stations would operate split for hours at a time as a sort of open intercom. There was an outcry that these carriers were monopolizing the band and in-band duplex operation was also banned at about the same time everywhere except in certain restricted segments of the VHF/UHF bands.

There was no serious concern in 1950 that amateurs were competition for the well established commercial broadcasters. The concern was that spectrum was being tied up for long periods for purposes other than \*working DX\*. This was anathema to a certain amateur contest sanctioning organization, and they lobbied to get the practices prohibited.

So the \*intent\* of the music prohibition was to free spectrum for DXing. We are within the original intent of the regulation if our transmission of music files doesn't interfere with DX operations. Now you know the rest of the story.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

-----

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #201

\*\*\*\*\*